

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Final Office Action dated 14 November 2005. Responsive to that Final Office Action, Claims 14 and 18-20 are amended for further prosecution. It is believed that with such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 14, 18, and 20 for various informalities. It is believed that the amendments incorporated hereby now remove the informalities and obviate the corresponding objections.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that the earlier rejection under the Matsuda, et al. had been overcome by the last Amendment, but asserted new grounds for rejection in view of the Hannah reference. The Examiner thus rejected Claims 14, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda, et al. in view of Hannah. In this regard, the Examiner acknowledged that Matsuda, et al. fails to explicitly teach waiting a predetermined waiting time for establishing a connection in device function mode, but cited Hannah for disclosing the feature. From this, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Matsuda, et al. system accordingly.

As for Claim 19, the Examiner merely objected to the Claim for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that the Claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the

base and any intervening claims. Claim 19 has accordingly been amended to independent form, incorporating therein the subject matter of its base Claim 14 and intervening Claim 18. It is believed that Claim 19 is now in allowable form.

Independent Claim 14 is also amended to now clarify in certain of its recited steps that the “connection” to be detected is one “established through said connection port.” As newly-amended independent Claim 14 further clarifies, examination for subsequent connection “within said predetermined waiting time” is made is then made for possibly effecting “reconfiguration of said connection port responsive thereto,” as newly-amended independent Claim 14 now more clearly recites.

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by newly-amended independent Claim 14 is nowhere disclosed by the cited references. Note in this regard that Hannah does enable alternate actuation of a peripheral device using a timer for determining the absence of an active host controller. As shown very clearly in Fig. 2B, however, such timer-based alternate operation is effected by Hannah’s apparatus through an altogether different communication link from that utilized for the host controller. As shown in each of the illustrated embodiments, the host controller and peripheral devices are respectively connected to Hannah’s USB hub through different respective ports, using communication links respectively dedicated thereto. The reference explains quite plainly in fact, that “a first communication port ... is utilized when the

apparatus is operating” in one mode, while a “second communication port is utilized when the apparatus is operating” in another mode (Abstract). This teaches diametrically away from any method which looks to “whether a connection is established through ... [a] connection port,” and examines “whether said connection is established within ... [a] predetermined waiting period for reconfiguration of said connection port responsive thereto,” as Claim 14 now clarifies.

The deficiency of Matsuda, et al.’s teachings having been readily acknowledged by the Examiner already, it is respectfully submitted that even when considered together, the cited Matsuda, et al. and Hannah references fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by newly-amended independent Claim 14 for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

MR3003-49
Serial Number: 10/617,722
Reply to Office Action dated 14 November 2005

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 1/19/2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586